

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
26 June 2019**

**Present:**

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Chairman)  
Councillor H. Harvey (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

C. Barnard	M. Gibson	R.W. Sider BEM
S. Buttar	T. Lagden	V. Siva
R. Chandler	J. McIlroy	B.B. Spoor
S.M. Doran	L. Nichols	
S.A. Dunn	R.J. Noble	

**In Attendance:** Councillor I.T.E. Harvey

**169/19 Minutes - 29 May 2019**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 May 2019 were approved as a correct record.

**170/19 Disclosures of Interest**

**a) Disclosures of interest under the Members' Code of Conduct**

Councillor H. Harvey declared a conflict of interest in item 5. - application 19/00428/FUL, St James School, Church Road, Ashford. She would leave the room during the debate and not vote on the matter.

**b) Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code**

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley declared that all members had received a presentation from officers on item 4. – application 19/00290/FUL, site at 17-51 London Road, Staines-upon-Thames. In addition those members who had sat during the previous administration had taken part in a site visit of other Berkeley Homes developments.

Councillors R.A. Smith-Ainsley, H. Harvey, S. Buttar, R. Chandler, S. Doran, S. Dunn, T. Lagden, J. McIlroy, L. Nichols, R. Noble, V. Siva and R.W. Sider BEM reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application 19/00290/FUL, site at 17-51 London Road, Staines-upon-Thames but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor R. Noble declared that he had visited the sites of all three applications, and also received correspondence in relation to application 19/00543/FUL, land at Orchard Close, Ashford but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor R.W. Sider declared that he had visited the site of application 19/00543/FUL, land at Orchard Close, Ashford but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

**171/19 Application No: 19/00290/FUL Development Site at 17 - 51 London Road, Staines-upon-Thames**

**Description:**

Erection of six buildings to provide 467 residential homes (Use class C3) and flexible commercial space at ground and first floors (Use Classes A1-A3, B1a, D1 or D2), car parking, pedestrian and vehicle access, landscaping and associated works.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager reported that 7 late letters of support had been received from residents of Ash House, including one undersigned by 23 residents/leaseholders.

The residents of Ash House and Berkeley Homes had agreed on a package of measures that they believed would make the proposal acceptable and this had been captured in a Memorandum of Understanding.

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Malcolm Beecher spoke **against** the proposed development raising the following key point:

- Air quality concerns

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Jack Nicholson spoke **for** the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Proposals will transform a vacant site
- Will regenerate Staines
- Will help the community
- Will deliver an improved scheme
- Will provide 41 high quality affordable units
- Will provide open space and landscaping
- Have listened to the community and Ash House residents are no longer objecting

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Site has long planning history and has been derelict for 15 years- will be an improvement
- Is an ambitious development
- 2016 permission was commenced but paused after the last refusal
- May benefit the street scene
- No objection from Staines Town Society
- Better scheme than 2016 approved plans and refused scheme
- Applicants have engaged positively with Ash House residents
- Development is further away from Ash House compared with refused scheme
- Decreased height of one block from 16 to 14 storeys
- Have addressed height, open space, parking, affordable housing issues
- Is an improvement on affordable housing compared with approved scheme and has been subjected to an independent assessment
- 41 rented properties are a better solution to meet our housing need compared with 71 shared ownership. Shared ownership dwellings do not provide for those in most need and are “lost” in terms of affordable housing stock
- Standard of construction on affordable housing is no different to private dwellings
- Query over renewable energy
- Will adversely affect the climate – CO2 emissions
- Will provide electric charging points for cars
- Development is not on the Green Belt
- No objection on environmental grounds

In accordance with Standing Order 22.4, Councillor H. Harvey called for a recorded vote on the Motion to approve the application.

For: 11	Councillors: C. Barnard, S. Buttar, R. Chandler, M. Gibson, H. Harvey, J. McIlroy, L. Nichols, R. Noble, R.W. Sider BEM, R.A. Smith-Ainsley and B. Spoor.
Against: 2	Councillors T. Lagden and V. Siva
Abstain: 2	Councillors S. Doran and S. Dunn

The Motion was carried.

**Decision:** The application was approved as set out in the Planning Committee Report, subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement.

**172/19 Application No: 19/00428/FUL St. James School, Church Road, Ashford**

Councillor H. Harvey left the meeting for the duration of this item.

**Description:**

Erection of new sports hall facility to include 4 no. badminton courts, fitness suite, 2 no. changing rooms, storage, first aid room and reception area. Demolition of existing multi use games area (MUGA) and provision of an outdoor 5 aside pitch and car park.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager reported the following updates to the report:

Paragraph 3.3, page 84 refers to the demolition of the gym in 2010. This was located on the northern part of the site.

The historical gym is Moot Hall located on the south east of the site but is no longer functional for gymnastics and is currently used as an assembly hall and for performing arts.

Paragraph 7.18, page 91 The applicant has confirmed that the sports hall could provide a range of sporting facilities for the community including cricket nets, 5-a-side football, badminton, fitness gym and basketball. The details of the uses will be agreed in consultation with Sport England and secured as condition 8 on page 99.

**Public Speaking:**

There were no public speakers for this item.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Sport facilities are very important for younger people encouraging team spirit and respect
- Very special circumstances have been demonstrated to approve the scheme
- The application has been endorsed by Sport England
- Will provide community uses
- Will provide facilities for the children for the future

**Decision:**

It was agreed to refer the application to the Secretary of State with a recommendation to approve, subject to conditions.

**173/19 Application No: 19/00543/FUL Land at Orchard Close, Ashford**

**Description:**

Erection of 3 bedroom chalet bungalow with ancillary access and parking.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager advised that a consultation response had been received from the Group Head of Neighbourhood Services raising no objection on refuse grounds.

The applicant had confirmed that the site had been re-surveyed since the previous application and this was reflected in the submitted site plan.

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Christopher Taylor spoke **against** the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Loss of sunlight and daylight
- Design not in keeping with the surroundings
- No other bungalows in the Close
- Overlooking associated with dormer windows
- Loss of parking spaces
- Highway safety concerns
- Loss of street lights with no plans to replace them

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Kevin Turner spoke **for** the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Planning permission granted 2 years ago
- No objection from Surrey CC
- Complies with the Council's Design SPD
- Is within an area of mixed development

Councillor R. Barratt, who had called the application in for determination by the Committee, submitted a statement as Ward Councillor against the proposed development, which was read out by the Chairman and raised the following key points:

- Overdevelopment
- Overlooking
- Loss of light
- Design out of keeping
- Excessive scale
- Too close to dwellings across the road
- Loss of parking and turning circle
- Traffic congestion
- Effect on emergency services and refuse collection
- Adverse impact on amenity of surrounding residents
- Does not make a positive contribution to the locality

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Planning permission has already been granted for a dwelling on the site
- Is not an attractive piece of land
- Dwelling will be on an "island"
- Site is scrubland

- Parking provided free of charge at present and will be lost
- Will improve the street scene
- No planning policies to refuse

**Decision:**

The application was approved as set out in the Planning Committee Report.

**174/19 Application No: 19/00483/FUL Building 200, BP International Centre, Chertsey Road, Sunbury-on-Thames**

The Planning Development Manager reported that this planning application related to the installation of a new atrium roof to Building 200, at the BP site off Chertsey Road in Sunbury-on-Thames. The application was approved under officer delegated powers on 30 May 2019 but as the site is owned by the Council was reported to the Planning Committee for the purposes of transparency.

**Resolved** to note that planning permission for a new atrium roof to Building 200 at the BP site was granted conditionally on 30 May 2019.

**175/19 Development Management Performance**

The Planning Development Manager reported on the Development Management Performance for the period April 2018 to March 2019.

**Resolved** to note the report.

**176/19 Planning Appeals Report**

The Planning Development Manager reported on the outcomes of Planning Appeals for the period 10 April 2019 to 13 June 2019.

**Resolved** to note the report.

**177/19 Urgent Items**

There were none.